COPY OF PAPERS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED 01/30/2002

Atty. Docket No. (Opt.) VIEO1100

GP12857 18

Applicant

Clarkson, et al. Application Number 09/882,722

Filed June 15, 2001

For

Printed Circuit Board Having Microelectronic Semiconductor Device Mount Area for Trace Routing Therethrough

Group Art Unit 2827

Examiner

Cuneo, Kamand

Honorable Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

0 1 2002

Certification Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on ...

Dear Commissioner:

In response to the Office Action mailed January 30, 2002, Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement for the reasons set forth below but elects to prosecute claims 1-9 and 14-18 of Group I if the restriction requirement is not withdrawn. Note that Applicants do not make any admission that the groups of claims as defined in the Office Action are independent of each other, not independent of each other, distinct from each other, or not distinct from each other.

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. (M.P.E.P. § 803, emphasis added). examination of the method claims will involve searching for methods that form printed circuit boards. In other words, a proper search of the method claims will yield references with printed circuit boards formed by those methods. Due to the co-extensive searching, searching and examination of the entire application must be made in accordance with the Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement for not meeting the search burden requirement set forth in the M.P.E.P.

The Office Action uses an "independent OR distinct" standard when the language in 35 U.S.C. § 121 clearly requires "independent AND distinct" (emphasis added). When -2-

statutory interpretation is at issue, the plain and unambiguous meaning of a statute prevails in the absence of clearly expressed legislative intent to the contrary. In re Donaldson, 29 U.S.P.Q.2d 1845, 1848. The Office Action fails to point out any language within the legislative history of the statute to support "AND" (conjunctive connector) as meaning "OR" (disjunctive connector). The fact that the PTO may have failed to adhere to a statutory mandate over an extended period of time does not justify its continuing to do so. Id. at 1849. The Office Action fails to point to any binding and compelling statutory, federal rule or judicial authority to support a position that "AND" in the statute means "OR." The Office Action does not address independence between the groups of claims at all. The fact that the Office Action does not address independence between the groups likewise causes the restriction requirement to be improper. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement for not meeting the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 121.

Applicants appreciate the time and effort expended by the Examiner to review this case. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case. Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants believe that no fees are due with this reply. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-0456 of Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich, LLP.

Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich LLP

Attorneys for Applicants

George R. Meyer Reg. No. 35,284

1221 South MoPac Expressway Suite 400

Austin, TX 78746-6875

(512) 457-7093 - Telephone

(512) 457-7001 - Facsimile